DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 257 509 JC 850 284

AUTHOR Coker, Richard; And Others
TITLE Institutional Retention Study: Gainesville Junior College. 1985.
INSTITUTION Gainesville Junior Coll., Ga.
PUB DATE 1 Jun 85
NOTE 40p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Black Students; Dropout Characteristics; Dropout Prevention; Dropout Research; *Enrollment Influences; Minority Groups; *School Holding Power; *Student Attrition; Student Personnel Services; Two Year Colleges; *Two Year College Students; *Withdrawal (Education)

ABSTRACT

An analysis is provided of student retention and attrition at Gainesville Junior College (GJC). Section I presents background information on the college's service area and the characteristics of its students. Section II presents results of a study of 1,590 of 1,762 students enrolled at GJC in fall 1983. This section examines: (1) retention rates among first-time freshmen, including a breakdown by race, full- or part-time status, and developmental studies or regular freshman status; (2) undergraduate student retention, including a breakdown by level, race, and full- or part-time status; (3) supplementary analyses and studies of the characteristics of students who returned and who did not return; and (4) results of a fall-winter-spring retention study of 481 students who did not enroll in the winter quarter after being enrolled in fall 1984. Section III discusses the causes of student attrition and includes a review of the literature; observations drawn from institutional studies; and observations regarding attrition among black students. Section IV presents strategies for improving the retention rate, focusing on the improvement of the advisement process, the development of a method of rating students in terms of their likelihood of persisting, retention strategies for "other race" students, and plans for improving retention in coming years. A student request for withdrawal form is appended. (HB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. F. Watkins

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED257509

INSTITUTIONAL RETENTION STUDY

GAINESVILLE JUNIOR COLLEGE

JUNE 1, 1985

Prepared By:

Richard Coker
Erdine Donovan
Martha Gaskill
J. Foster Watkins
Doyle Webb

JC 850 284

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. RETENTION RATES 7

1. First-Time Freshmen Retention 7

2. Undergraduate Student Retention 10

3. Supplementary Analyses and Studies 12

4. Fall-Winter-Spring Retention Study 14

III. CAUSES OF ATTRITION 19

1. Review of Literature 19

2. Observations from Institutional Study 24

3. Observations Relative to Attrition of Blacks 25

IV. STRATEGIES FOR IMPROVING RETENTION RATE 26

1. Retention Strategies for "Other Race" Students 30

2. Strategies for Retention of Students 32

3. A Look Ahead 34

BIBLIOGRAPHY 37

I. INTRODUCTION

Gainesville Junior College has throughout its nineteen years of existence been committed to meeting the full needs of the students in its service area. Periodically, the College has conducted needs assessments in an effort to more deeply involve itself in the mission of serving its area, and it has heavily recruited students on the basis of understanding and meeting their needs. Like most colleges of its type, Gainesville Junior College has long recognized that it has a retention problem and has made considerable efforts to retain the students who matriculate at the Junior College. However, no systematically developed or continuing studies of this retention problem have been conducted in the past. The College took a first step last year and conducted a retention study as a part of the Regents' response to the System's deliberations with the Office of Civil Rights. That study established baselines for the current study which will be utilized as a regular part of the generation of information on which the College will make programmatic and recruitment decisions. Although the immediate impetus of this study is the Regents' requirement that it be done in partial fulfillment of the University System's response to the Office of Civil Rights, Gainesville Junior College welcomes the opportunity to continue this systematic effort.

The first step in a systematic retention effort is identifying the kinds of students who tend to drop out short of their goals, and relative to this the College had suffered from a failure to conduct a thorough retention study. To conduct a systematic examination of the retention question, one must understand the characteristics of one's institution and how these characteristics relate to or impact upon retention. Gainesville Junior College is a nonresidential, commuter, community college offering a full range of both transfer and career programs. The College maintains a close working relationship with Lanier Area Technical School and other area vocational/technical institutions in offering a broad spectrum of joint degree programs.

For sometime the College has offered off-campus work in Gwinnett County and is now offering an external degree program at Gwinnett Area Technical School at Lawrenceville.

Like most colleges of its type, Gainesville Junior College is essentially open-enrollment with the result that a high proportion of its entering students are not prepared for college-level work, either because of inadequate secondary preparation or--in the case of the many non-traditional returning students--because of years of absence from the classroom with an attendant loss of academic skills. Also, since the College is open-enrollment and enjoys transferability of its credits under the core curriculum concept of the University System of Georgia, a large number of students come to the College only temporarily either to repair grade point averages in order to be readmitted to other System schools or to initially earn credits and demonstrate proficiency in order to be admitted for the first time to other schools. This factor is responsible for a large measure of the College's "attrition," although it is something that the College can do little about. In fact, in the case of the students whose goals were to be admitted to and remain at other schools, the College in "losing" such students before graduation is really contributing to their goals.

The section of Georgia from which Gainesville Junior College draws the great majority of its students is preponderantly white. (See Table I) As noted in that table, the two counties supplying the greatest number of students to the College are Hall and Gwinnett. In the Fall of 1984, 656 students (37.6% of the student body) came from Hall County and 364 (20.9%) came from Gwinnett County. In the 1980 Census Hall County had a black population of only 6,822 (9.0%) and Gwinnett County had 4,094 (2.5%). Forsyth County, which supplied 158 students (9.1%) in Fall 1984, had a black population of one person in the 1980 Census. Consequently, Gainesville Junior College's black student population of 61 (3.8%) in Fall 1983 is consistent with the racial makeup of its service area. The College is extremely committed, though, to do even better in recruiting and retaining qualified black students in keeping

with its mission of defining and meeting the educational needs of its constituency.

TABLE I

Service Area Enrollment By County

Fall Quarters 1982-84

County	1982	1983	1984	Black Population No. / %*
Hall	701 (41.8%)	721 (40.9%)	656 (37.6%)	6,822 / 9.0
Gwinnett	316 (18.8%)	341 (19.4%)	364 (20.9%)	4,094 / 2.5
Forsyth	147 (8.8%)	152 (8.6%)	158 (9.1%)	1 / 0.0
Jackson	122 (7.3%)	120 (6.8%)	109 (6.3%)	2,750 / 10.9
Barrow	70 (4.2%)	78 (4.4%)	88 (5.1%)	3,132 / 14.7
Clarke	49 (2.9%)	56 (3.2%)	52 (2.9%)	17,568 / 23.6
Habersham	33 (2.0%)	41 (2.3%)	67 (3.8%)	1,321 / 5.3
Banks	18 (1.1%)	30 (1.7%)	24 (1.4%)	433 / 5.0
White	19 (1.1%)	26 (1.5%)	21 (1.2%)	392 / 3.9
Dawson	15 (0.9%)	22 (1.2%)	26 (1.5%)	0 / 0.0
Madison	9 (0.5%)	14 (0.8%)	13 (0.7%)	1,942 / 10.9
Oconee	10 (0.6%)	13 (0.7%)	7 (0.4%)	1,268 / 10.2
Stephens	8 (0.5%)	14 (0.8%)	10 (0.6%)	2,637 / 12.1
Lumpkin	29 (1.7%)	13 (0.7%)	19 (1.1%)	232 / 2.2
Walton	4 (0.2%)	10 (0.6%)	11 (0.6%)	6,576 / 21.1
Pickens	14 (0.8%)	8 (0.5%)	5 (0.3%)	270 / 2.4
DeKalb	10 (0.6%)	6 (0.3%)	9 (0.5%)	130,980 / 27.1
Other	102 (6.1%)	97 (5.5%)	105 (6.0%)	
TOTAL	1,679 (100 %)	1,762 (100 %)	1,744 (100 %)	

*1980 Census Figures

The area which Gainesville Junior College serves as reflected in the data in Table II is considerably below average in educational attainment relative to the State of Georgia as a whole. According to the 1980 Census only two counties in its immediate 10-county service area came up to the statewide level in median years of school completed or percent of high school graduates, and most were far below average. Hence, a large number of students at Gainesville Junior College are still first-generation high school graduates and obviously are representing their families for the first time in attempting college work. Those data support the possibility that

low educational attainment of parents and their lack of support for educational pursuits could be a contributing factor to low retention rates.

TABLE II

Educational Attainments
GJC Service Area By County

Based on 1980 Census

County	% 0-8 Yrs. Elementary	% 1-3 Yrs High School	% 4 Yrs. High School	% 1-3 Yrs. College	% 4 or More College	Median Yrs. Of School Completed
Hall	28.4	23.5	24.5	11.5	12.2	11.8
Gwinnett	12.9	15.4	32.9	19.9	13.9	12.7
Forsyth	27.4	21.2	30.8	11.3	8.7	12.0
Jackson	33.9	25.4	25.3	7.5	8.0	11.1
Barrow	34.5	27.8	21.8	8.4	7.5	10.8
Habersham	34.1	22.4	24.6	9.6	9.3	11.2
Dawson	39.2	24.1	25.6	6.6	4.4	10.5
Lumpkin	39.3	17.6	24.9	8.5	9.8	10.7
Pickens	40.8	21.3	22.6	8.4	6.9	10.4
Banks	35.5	25.0	28.5	6.1	5.0	10.9
White	33.9	18.1	27.5	11.1	9.6	11.7
Georgia	23.7	19.9	28.5	13.3	14.6	12.2

An analysis of the attrition must also consider the characteristics of the Gainesville Junior College student body. This examination should give some indications of possible clues relative to the relationship between attrition rates and the reviewed characteristics. Table III displays the demographics of the population on selected characteristics as it has emerged over the past three years.

As this table demonstrates, the male-female ratio is nearly equal at the college and has remained relatively constant over these three years with a slight growth in female participation. The black student population, in keeping with the extremely low percentage in the College's service area, has remained in the 3 percent range over time. Nearly three-quarters of the students were less than 22 years of age, representing a continuation of the marked drop in average age which the College has experienced since the diminution of the Vietnam Era veteran enrollment which

began in the latter part of the 1970's. The average SAT scores clearly demonstrate the nature of an open-enrollment student body and suggest that much of the problem of attrition possibly lies in a poorly prepared constituency. However, the average college grade point average of 2.49 is a fairly respectable "C" average and suggests that the students who do persist at GJC do moderately well academically. Since the 731 new students (42%) in the Fall of 1984 had no GPA to enter into this computation, the 2.49 GPA represents a number drawn entirely from persisters. As one would expect in a fall term and in a college with a degree of attrition, 42 percent of the 1984 fall students are first-time enrollees. Fifty-one percent of these were Developmental Studies (DS) students who would naturally be more prone to attrition. Interestingly enough only 449 of the students (26%) graduated from high school in the preceding June, so many of the first-time enrollees are transfers and non-traditional students who possibly were bringing academic skills which had diminished over time.

TABLE III

Student Body Characteristics*

Characteristics	Fall 1982	Fall 1983	Fall 1984
Total Enrollment	1,689	1,762	1,744
Male	812 (48%)	851 (48%)	811 (47%)
Female	877 (52%)	911 (52%)	933 (54%)
Black	78 (5%)	77 (4%)	82 (5%)
Other	1,611 (95%)	1,685 (96%)	1,662 (95%)
Average Math SAT	397.0	400.0	396.7
Average Verbal SAT	380.2	386.1	381.2
High School Avg.	3.04	3.12	3.10
GJC GPA	2.47	2.50	2.49
Age 18 And Less	575 (34%)	581 (33%)	541 (31%)
Age 19 To 21	631 (37%)	645 (37%)	682 (39%)
Age 22 To 24	159 (9%)	150 (9%)	163 (9%)
Age 25 To 27	101 (6%)	111 (6%)	91 (5%)
Age 28 To 30	70 (4%)	83 (5%)	91 (5%)
Age 31 And Above	153 (9%)	192 (11%)	176 (10%)
First Time At GJC	706 (42%)	722 (41%)	730 (42%)
New In Dev. Stud.	338 (20%)	338 (19%)	373 (21%)
Returning	983 (58%)	1,040 (59%)	1,014 (58%)
June H.S. Grads.	443 (25%)	464 (26%)	449 (26%)
Not June H.S. Grads.	1,246 (75%)	1,298 (74%)	1,295 (74%)

*Total student body which includes some sub-groups who were excluded by System guidelines from the Fall to Fall Retention Study.

Table IV examines for the last 10 years the relationship between the number and percent of new students at Gainesville Junior College who were Developmental Studies students and the number and percent of the college graduates who were former DS students.

TABLE IV

Entrance And Graduation Of Developmental Studies Students

Year	New Students	D. S. Students	Percent D. S. Students	Graduates	Graduates Who Took D. S.	Percent Graduates Who Took D. S.
1974-75	1,028	455	44.3%	151	29	19.3%
1975-76	1,272	626	49.2%	176	44	25.0%
1976-77	1,133	519	45.8%	153	49	32.0%
1977-78	1,085	548	50.5%	215	101	47.1%
1978-79	1,062	558	52.5%	154	65	42.2%
1979-80	1,163	572	49.2%	158	68	43.0%
1980-81	1,304	481	36.9%	170	66	38.8%
1981-82	1,272	491	38.6%	148	60	40.5%
1982-83	1,419	505	35.6%	166	63	38.0%
1983-84	1,373	622	45.3%	152	54	35.5%
TOTALS	12,111	5,377	44.4%	1,643	598	36.4%

The table reveals a surprisingly close relationship between the percentage of new students who were developmental in each of the years covered and the percentages of graduates who were former DS students. These data suggest that DS at the College accomplishes its purpose since its exiters persist to graduation in about the same proportion as non-DS students. There is, however, a marked difference between the number of new students who enter in a given year and the number who graduate. As the table shows over the 10-year period covered, there were only 1,643 graduates while 12,111 new students entered, a low percentage of 13.9 percent.

II. RETENTION RATES

There were 1,7[illegible] students enrolled at Gainesville Junior College in the Fall of 1983. Based upon System-level decisions, the following sub-groups were excluded from the analysis: non-resident alien, joint enrollment, transient, unclassified, and auditor. When these sub-groups were excluded, 1,590 students remained for inclusion in the 1983-84 Fall-to-Fall Retention Study. Data are provided in the four required tables as specified in the Retention Study Guidelines provided by the System staff. Additional data of a supplementary nature are provided in tabular form as deemed appropriate. Most of the supplementary tables are formatted from the data bases generated in the 1982-83 GJC Retention Study which was conducted in the absence of System guidelines which are now available.

1. First-Time Freshmen Retention

Retention data for New First-Time Freshmen (FTF) who were full-time students in the fall of 1983 are provided in Table 1A. Initial enrollment status, Developmental Studies or regular Freshmen, was utilized as an analysis variable.

TABLE 1A

New First-Time Freshmen (FTF) By Race
Full-Time

		# FTF Fall 1982	For Same Students: # Still Enrolled Fall 1983	# Graduated	# Transferred	Retention Rate	# FTF Fall 1983	For Same Students: # Still Enrolled Fall 1984	# Graduated	# Transferred	Retention Rate
Developmental Studies	B	28	9	--	--	32.1	20	10	--	--	50.0
	AO	401	231	--	--	57.6	236	123	--	6	54.7
Freshmen	B	--	--	--	--	--	2	2	--	--	100.0
	AO	--	--	--	--	--	165	106	--	14	72.7

In the Developmental Studies enrollment category, 10 of 20 (50%) black FTF who studied on a full-time basis during the Fall of 1983 were still enrolled in Fall of 1984. None of these black enrollees had transferred to other institutions. Similarly, 123 of 236 All Other (AO) students in this enrollment category were still enrolled during Fall of 1984 at GJC while six students had transferred. The total retained AO Developmental

Studies students--129 of 236-- reflected a retention rate as defined in the current study of 54.7 percent.

Comparable data for regularly enrolled FTF students during Fall of 1983 indicate that two of two blacks and 120 of 165 (72.7%) AO were retained through the Fall of 1984. Fourteen of the FTF in the AO category had transferred to other System institutions.

Data for part-time students who were FTF during the Fall of 1983 are presented in Table 1B. Two black students in this classification were enrolled in Developmental Studies while no blacks were regularly enrolled as FTF on a part-time basis.

TABLE 1B

New First-Time Freshman (FTF) by Race
Part-Time

		# FTF Fall 1982	For Same Students: # Still Enrolled Fall 1983	For Same Students: # Graduated	For Same Students: # Transferred	Retention Rate	# FTF Fall 1983	For Same Students: # Still Enrolled Fall 1984	For Same Students: # Graduated	For Same Students: # Transferred	Retention Rate
Developmental Studies	B						2	--	--	--	0.0
	AO						51	13	--	--	25.5
Freshmen	B						--	--	--	--	--
	AO						52	12	--	2	26.9

Neither of these two black students was enrolled during the Fall of 1984. Surprisingly similar figures are reported for the AO students in both enrollment categories. Thirteen of 51 (25.5%) Developmental Studies 1983 enrollees were still in school at GJC during the Fall of 1984. Fourteen of 52 (26.9%) FTF in 1983 were retained in 1984 with 12 continuing at GJC and two having transferred.

Drawing upon the basic categories utilized in the 1982-83 Retention Study, supplementary data are presented in Table 1C in comparable format for the two Fall-to-Fall periods for which such data were readily available. These data revealed that for black FTF who studied on a full-time basis the 1982-83 retention rate was 32.1 percent (9 of 28) and for 1983-84 was 54.5 percent (12 of 22). The per-

centage gain in retention with a somewhat smaller black population exceeded 20 percent.

TABLE 1C

First-Time Freshmen By Race
Full-Time

	# FTF Fall 1982	# Still Enrolled Fall 1983	Retention Rate	# FTF Fall 1983	# Still Enrolled Fall 1984	Retention Rate
Black	28	9	32.1	22	12	54.5
AO	401	231	57.6	401	229	57.1

Similar data on AO students revealed little change percentagewise, as 57.6 percent (231 of 401) were retained in 1982-83 while 57.1 percent (229 of 401) were retained in 1983-84.

Table 1D contains supplementary data for FTF who were enrolled part-time during the two Fall-to-Fall periods. Minimal black enrollments were reflected in these data with five in 1982 and only two in 1983. One of the five Fall of 1982 students was retained while both of the 1983 Fall enrollees were not retained.

TABLE 1D

First-Time Freshman By Race
Part-Time

	#FTF Fall 1982	# Still Enrolled Fall 1983	Retention Rate	# FTF Fall 1983	# Still Enrolled Fall 1984	Retention Rate
Black	5	1	20.0	2	--	0.0
AO	123	50	40.7	103	25	24.3

The retention percentages for AO students declined rather dramatically over the two periods of study. Fifty of 123 (40.7%) AO part-time students were retained from Fall of 1982 to Fall of 1983. Similar figures for the 1983-84 Falls were 25 of 103 (24.3%). Percentagewise, the decline in retention for AO FTF who studied on a part-time basis exceeded 15 percent.

2. Undergraduate Student Retention

Tables 2A and 2B contain data relative to the retention patterns of undergraduate students including FTF over the two Fall-to-Fall retention study periods. Full-time student data are presented in Table 2A followed by data for part-time enrollees in Table 2B. In keeping with its institutional status as a junior college, GJC data are presented only for Developmental Studies and regular Freshmen enrollment categories. Racial categories are limited to Black (B) and All Other (AO) classifications.

TABLE 2A

Undergraduate Students By Level And Race
Full-Time Students

		# Fall 1982	For Same Students # Still Enrolled Fall 1983	# Graduated	# Transferred	Retention Rate	# Fall 1983	For Same Students # Still Enrolled Fall 1984	# Graduated	# Transferred	Retention Rate
Developmental Studies	B	32	9	--	--	28.1	30	10	2	2	46.7
	AO	283	140	--	--	49.5	352	166	16	12	55.1
Freshmen	B	20	3	--	--	15.0	15	6	--	1	46.7
	AO	373	198	--	--	53.1	425	244	5	38	62.8

The data presented for black full-time students in the Developmental Studies category in Table 2A revealed that nine of 32 students (28.1%) were retained from Fall of 1982 to Fall of 1983. Similar numbers for Fall of 1983 to Fall of 1984 were 14 of 30 (46.7%). Assuming similar graduated and transfer numbers for 1982-83 which were not considered, the change, however, is possibly quite small. All Other Developmental Studies undergraduate retention figures for 1982-83 were 140 of 283 (49.5%) and for 1983-84 were cumulatively 194 of 352 (55.1%) with consideration given to 16 graduated and 12 transferred students. Again, the basic comparisons, leaving out graduates and transfers, indicated that the percentage retention figures for the two periods seem to be quite similar.

When regular Freshmen were considered, black retention in 1982-83 was 3 of 20 (15.0%) and in 1983-84 was 7 of 15 (46.7%). Even allowing for the one transfer

student, these percentages represent an improvement in retention of FTF blacks of possible importance. Comparable figures for AO students for 1982-83 were 198 of 373 (53.1%) and 267 of 425 (62.8%). Likewise, consideration given through improved SIRS tracking in 1983-84 to graduates (5) and transfers (38) probably indicates at best a maintenance of retention power over the two years.

Retention data for part-time undergraduate students are presented in Table 2B with consideration given to the two enrollment categories of Developmental Studies (DS) and regular freshman status. Small numbers of blacks in both categories limit any analysis and interpretation of their possible meaning.

TABLE 2B

Undergraduate Students By Level And Race
Part-Time Students

		For Same Students					For Same Students			
		# Fall 1982	# Still Enrolled Fall 1983	# Graduated	# Transferred	Retention Rate	# Fall 1983	# Still Enrolled Fall 1984	# Graduated	# Transferred	Retention Rate
Developmental Studies	B	3	1	--	--	33.3	5	--	--	--	--
	AO	76	30			39.5	108	32	2	1	32.4
Freshmen	B	8	2	--	--	25.0	3	1	--	--	33.3
	AO	241	72	--	--	29.9	253	82	--	7	35.2

With respect to AO students in the DS status, the retention percentage declined from 39.5 percent in 1982-83 (30 of 76) to 32.4 percent in 1983-84 (35 of 108). The decline in percentage would possibly have been more had the graduate and transfer data been reflected in the 1982-83 study. For regular Freshmen, retention percentage reflected an increase to 35.2 percent (89 of 253) for 1983-84 from 29.9 percent (72 of 241) in the prior year. Even eliminating the seven transferred students from consideration, this shift possibly reflects a positive increase in retention power.

3. Supplementary Analyses and Studies

In attempting to determine possible personal characteristics of students which might be related to retention, profiling techniques were utilized. The basic data generated from this perspective are presented in Table V for the 1983-84 Fall-to Fall period. The format of the table allows an inspection of the data giving consideration to possible differences on the selected characteristics in the left column among the total 1983 Fall population (Column 1) and those from that group who did (Column 2) or did not (Column 3) return in the Fall of 1984. Inspection of the data in this table revealed little difference on these characteristics among the total population and those who returned or did not return. Single students persisted to a slight degree more percentagewise than did their married student colleagues. Retention seemed strongest for the 18 and less age group and declined with increasing age beyond that range.

TABLE V

Profile Of Selected Student Characteristics
For The Period Fall 1983 To Fall 1984

Characteristics	Total Population	Total Who Returned	Total Who Did Not Return
Total	1,590	614	976
Male	776 (48.8%)*	296 (48.2%)*	480 (49.2%)*
Female	814 (51.2%)	318 (51.8%)	496 (50.8%)
Black	61 (3.8%)	21 (3.4%)	40 (4.1%)
All Other	1,529 (96.2%)	593 (96.6%)	936 (95.9%)
Single	1,269 (79.8%)	514 (83.7%)	755 (77.4%)
Married	321 (21.2%)	100 (16.3%)	221 (22.6%)
Age 18 And Less	508 (31.9%)	282 (45.9%)	226 (23.2%)
Age 19 To 21	627 (39.4%)	199 (32.4%)	428 (43.9%)
Age 22 To 24	133 (8.4%)	38 (6.2%)	95 (9.7%)
Age 25 To 27	92 (5.8%)	29 (4.7%)	63 (6.5%)
Age 28 To 30	74 (4.6%)	21 (3.4%)	53 (5.4%)
Age 31 And Above	156 (9.8%)	45 (7.3%)	111 (11.4%)
High School Avg.	3.13	3.21	3.07
GJC GPA	2.48	2.52	2.46
SAT Math	399	402.78	396
SAT Verbal	385	383.91	386

*Percentages calculated within column groups

Additional inspection was given to sex as a possible factor in retention through the secondary analysis of the same characteristics in Table VI. That inspection revealed that younger females (Age 18 and Less) were retained to a greater extent than young males. Married females were more persistent than married males with respect to retention.

TABLE VI

Profile Of Selected Student Characteristics
For The Period Fall 1983 To Fall 1984

Characteristics	Males Who Returned	Males Who Did Not Return	Females Who Returned	Females Who Did Not Return
Male	296	480	--	--
Female	--	--	318	496
Black	9 (3.0%)*	18 (3.8%)*	12 (3.8%)*	22 (4.4%)*
All Other	287 (97.0%)	462 (96.2%)	306 (96.2%)	474 (95.6%)
Single	265 (89.5%)	405 (84.4%)	249 (78.3%)	350 (70.6%)
Married	31 (10.5%)	75 (15.6%)	69 (21.7%)	146 (29.4%)
Age 18 And Less	126 (42.6%)	105 (21.9%)	156 (49.1%)	121 (24.4%)
Age 19 To 21	116 (39.2%)	238 (49.6%)	83 (26.1%)	190 (38.3%)
Age 22 To 24	18 (6.1%)	50 (10.4%)	20 (6.3%)	45 (9.1%)
Age 25 To 27	19 (6.4%)	30 (6.2%)	10 (3.1%)	33 (6.7%)
Age 28 To 30	9 (3.0%)	27 (5.6%)	12 (3.8%)	26 (5.2%)
Age 31 And Above	8 (2.7%)	30 (6.3%)	37 (11.6%)	81 (16.3%)
High School Avg.	3.07	2.91	3.34	3.24
GJC GPA	2.33	2.25	2.70	2.65
SAT Math	418	406	389	387
SAT Verbal	387	380	381	392

*Percentages calculated within column groups

4. Fall-Winter-Spring Retention Study

An internal Fall-Winter-Spring Retention Study was conducted during the 1984-85 academic year. A population of 481 students were identified who were enrolled in the 1984 fall quarter who did not return in the subsequent winter quarter. Survey techniques were employed through a mailed questionnaire to these students who possibly are "stopouts" as described in the retention literature. Returns were received from 140 students (29.1%) without the use of follow-up techniques. The results of the analysis of those returns are presented on page 16 utilizing the format of the questionnaire.

Consideration of the data generated by this survey were compatible with expectations and deserve little further discussion at this point in the report. In passing, it should be noted that all requests for information and assistance were responded to and the survey results were shared internally.

The survey instrument utilized in the Fall-Winter-Spring Retention Study with slight modification was incorporated during the spring quarter in the formal process for withdrawing from school. Increased attention in that process was given to exit interviews with counselors, responses to the revised survey form, and discussions with the President and/or the Dean on a voluntary basis. Data generated to this point during the spring quarter from withdrawing students (87 AO and 4 blacks) are presented below in a tabular form dictated by the format of the instrument.

Check any/all factors listed below which influenced decision to withdraw from GJC:

8	a. financial reasons	1	h. course(s) cancelled
12	b. received job offer	3	i. courses too difficult
14	c. change in work hours	18	j. no time for study
2	d. moved from the area	5	k. don't like course
0	e. no transportation	5	l. don't need course
14	f. personal health reasons	5	m. career plans changed
17	g. personal/family problems	14	n. other

Do you plan to return to GJC?

41 a. Yes 7 b. No 15 c. Not sure

What are your plans for the immediate future?

49 a. full-time employment

7 b. enroll in another school

7 c. other

Profiling techniques were utilized for this Fall-Winter-Spring study in a manner similar to those employed with the basic retention study population. The results of those analyses are presented in Table VII. Inspection of those data revealed that females were more apt to return to school (66.7% to 33.3%) and that the largest

TABLE VII

Student Body Characteristics
1984-85 School Year

Category	Total Population Fall 1984*	Here Fall 1984 Not Here Wtr 1985	Here Fall 1984 Not Here Wtr 1985 Return Spr 1985
Total	1,744	481	48
Male	811 (46.5%)	233 (48.4%)**	16 (33.3%)**
Female	933 (53.5%)	248 (51.6%)	32 (66.7%)
Black	82 (4.7%)	25 (5.2%)	2 (4.2%)
Other Race	1,662 (95.3%)	456 (94.8%)	46 (95.8%)
Freshman	693 (39.7%)	290 (60.3%)	25 (53.2%)
Sophomore	508 (29.2%)	191 (39.7%)	22 (46.8%)
Single	1,418 (81.3%)	384 (79.8%)	30 (62.5%)
Married	326 (18.7%)	97 (20.2%)	18 (37.5%)
Age 18 And Less	541 (31.0%)	77 (16.0%)	4 (8.3%)
Age 19 To 21	682 (39.1%)	204 (42.4%)	23 (47.9%)
Age 22 To 24	163 (9.2%)	72 (15.0%)	3 (6.3%)
Age 25 To 27	91 (5.2%)	38 (7.9%)	2 (4.2%)
Age 28 To 30	91 (5.2%)	33 (6.9%)	3 (6.3%)
Age 31 And Above	176 (10.1%)	57 (11.9%)	13 (27.1%)
High School Avg	3.10	2.99	3.01
GJC GPA	2.49	2.35	2.49
SAT Math	397	391	385
SAT Verbal	381	380	382

*Note: These figures reflect the total student body for Fall 1984 and include some students not included in some of the earlier tables.

**Note: These are percentages within the same classification

GAINESVILLE JUNIOR COLLEGE
Student Questionnaire March 29, 1985

Below is the analysis of the data collected from responding students of the questionnaire sent to students who were enrolled in Fall '84 but did not return Winter '85. Four hundred eighty-one (481) questionnaires were sent to former students and 140 were returned (29.1%).

Question 1
Do you plan to return to GJC in the near future?

a.	Yes	69	49.6%
b.	No	47	33.8%
c.	Don't Know	23	16.6%

1. When do you expect to return?

Spring	32	54.2%
Summer	8	13.5%
Fall	17	28.8%
Winter	2	3.5%

2. Check any mailings you would like to receive.

(a) Application	14	14.1%	(d) Financial Aid Info.	8	8.1%
(b) Catalog	9	9.1%	(e) Advisor's Name	22	22.2%
(c) Schedule	40	40.4%	(f) Other	6	6.1%

Question 2
Below is a list of factors frequently mentioned by students as having influenced their decision not to return to GJC. Check any of the factors which influenced your decision not to return to GJC this quarter.

a.	Financial Reasons	31
b.	Job Offer	12
c.	Change in work hours	19
d.	Course(s) too difficult	3
e.	Didn't like course	5
f.	Not enough time for study	27
g.	Personal/Family problems not related to college	15
h.	Health reasons	8
i.	Moved..Not convenient to continue to GJC	5
j.	Transportation complications	1
k.	Class(es) cancelled	1
l.	Completed coursework needed at GJC	28
m.	Could not take course(s) at time scheduled this quarter	17
n.	Course(s) needed not offered this quarter	18
o.	Transient student--returned to my home school	7
p.	Career plans changed	8
q.	Other	42

Question 3
What are you doing now?

a.	Homemaker	14	
b.	Taking classes	41	
c.	Working	104	
	1. approx how many hrs per week	39	Avg.
d.	Other	6	

percentage of returnees were from the 19-21 (47.9%) and the 31 and Above 27.1%) age groups. The very young student (18 and Less) apparently has not developed a tendency toward persistence as only 4 of 77 returned after this one quarter's absence.

Consistent with the emphasis within the System to retain minority students, special attention was focused upon the 61 blacks who were enrolled during the 1983 fall quarter. Profiling techniques were utilized with this group as reflected in Table VIII. Retention seems to be much stronger with younger blacks and falls off considerably with age categories above 19-21. SAT scores indicated that the stronger students on that measure of academic potential seem to be persisting. Low SAT verbal scores seem to be highly related to dropout potential among blacks.

Follow-up data on the 40 blacks who were not enrolled in Fall 1984 indicated that 22 of those students were in some degree of academic difficulty (15 on exclusion and 7 on probation), 6 had transferred to other institutions, 3 had been in short-term enrollments for a specific study option which had been completed, 1

TABLE VIII

Characteristics Of Black Students
For The Period Fall 1983
To Fall 1984

Category	Fall 1983	Blacks Who Returned	Blacks Who Did Not Return	Total
Total Students	1,590	21 (34.0%)*	40 (66.0%)*	61
Male	776 (48.8%)	9 (15.0%)	18 (30.0%)	27
Female	814 (51.2%)	12 (20.0%)	22 (36.0%)	34
Single	1,269 (79.8%)	18 (30.0%)	32 (52.0%)	50
Married	321 (21.2%)	3 (5.0%)	8 (13.0%)	11
Age 18 And Less	508 (31.9%)	6 (10.0%)	7 (11.0%)	13
Age 19 To 21	627 (39.4%)	10 (16.0%)	19 (31.0%)	29
Age 22 To 24	133 (8.4%)	1 (2.0%)	4 (7.0%)	5
Age 25 To 27	92 (5.8%)	1 (2.0%)	3 (5.0%)	4
Age 28 To 30	74 (4.6%)	2 (3.0%)	3 (5.0%)	5
Age 31 And Aboe	156 (9.8%)	1 (2.0%)	4 (7.0%)	5
High School Avg.	3.13	2.80	2.75	
GJC GPA	2.48	2.43	2.28	
SAT Math	399	333	303	
SAT Verbal	385	305	265	

*Note: These percentages are calculated from the total number of 61 blacks enrolled Fall 1983.

out-of-state student had dropped because of dissatisfactory adjustments to the athletic program, 1 drop out cited babysitting problems, and 2 students who had been enrolled in medically related pre-preparation fields discontinued their studies while in good standing to rethink their career goals in light of pending academic requirements. Data were not available from the other 5 students for inclusion in this report.

III. CAUSES OF ATTRITION

1. Review of Literature

The attrition (and retention) of college students is a topic which has been of more than casual interest to educators for quite some time, as evidenced by the volume of research which has been reported in the literature during the past several decades (Pantages and Creedon, 1978). The specific nature of that interest has changed, however, in recent years. College administrators did not often become alarmed if attrition rates were high during the decades of the 1960's and 1970's, a time when enrollment was rapidly increasing and recruitment was easy. The prevailing attitude seemed to be that if a student drops out, there is another waiting to take his place.

With the approach of the 1980's, accompanied by predictions of a significant reduction in the number of potential college recruits, attrition became a matter of increasingly urgent concern among college administrators. Ramist states that the concern about attrition has now taken on the dimension of an urgent administrative necessity (Ramist, 1981). Noel states that based upon Census Bureau statistics and HEW data, it is anticipated that by 1991 there will be a half-million fewer degree-students entering college than in 1974, a drop of 28 percent (Noel, 1976). Friedlander translates attrition statistics into dollars and suggests that the cost is substantial. To illustrate, he cites an example in which during the academic year 1978-79 student attrition alone (including course drops and withdrawals) cost a community college in California over $2.5 million in state funds (Friedlander, 1981). Ramist suggests that (recent) recognition of the imminent decline in the number of college-age students has made it urgent for institutions to understand which students drop out and why, and to find ways to influence them to stay. He further cautions that a college cannot, and for the benefit of its students, ought not try to hold on to every student who wishes to drop out or stop out, and he suggests that a more beneficial long-term strategy is to encourage retention by upgrading the educational

services provided for the students (Bamist, 1981). Friedlander (1981) states that the challenge facing community colleges is to devise strategies for identifying and assisting those students who experience academic difficulties before they withdraw from their classes. In addressing the role and responsibility of the college, Beal and Noel suggest that retention should not be the goal of the college; instead, it should be the by-product of quality instruction and services provided to students (Beal and Noel, 1980).

The literature includes numerous references to the extent to which attrition occurs. Batdorf refers to Knoell's study which, he says, makes it clear that today's student is remarkably less interested in long-term educational commitments and the accompanying degrees, certificates and grades by which higher education traditionally has defined both success and satisfaction (Batdorf, [illegible]). Noel calls attention to a Carnegie Commission report which indicates that six out of every ten (60%) students enrolling in college will fail to get the ultimate degree to which they aspire (Noel, 1976). Again, Batdorf (1978) says that with few exceptions, between 30 and 40 percent of all entering first-time freshmen leave the community college after or prior to completion of that initial quarter or semester of enrollment. Based upon their review of attrition studies, Pantages and Creedon conclude that for every ten students who enter college in the United States, only four will graduate from that college four years later. They also indicate that of the remaining six, three dropped out during the first year; also, that three of the six will eventually obtain a degree from some college (Pantages and Creedon, 1978). Their review reveals additional findings which are of interest: Several researchers agree that most attrition occurs during or at the end of the first year, with Iffert estimating the first-year drop out at approximately 273 out of every 1,000 students; Summerskill reported attrition rates of individual institutions ranging from 12 percent to 82 percent, with a median loss of 50 percent---the rate which has not changed significantly in four decades (Pantages and Creedon, 1978). In their comparison among two-year public, two-year

private, four-year public, and four-year private colleges, Beal and Noel report attrition rates which range from a low of 30 percent at four-year private colleges to a high of 45 percent at two-year public colleges (Beal and Noel, 1980).

College administrators long have been interested in identifying those factors which significantly affect the attrition and retention of students. That interest has led to the identification of both personal and institutional characteristics which appear to be related to attrition or retention. Batdorf identifies the two groups who are most likely candidates for premature attrition as developmental (one or more basic skill dificiencies or learning disabilities) and exploratory (lacks an articulate, integrated and achieveable educational and career objective) students, and estimates that at least one-third of all entering community college freshmen would fall in the classification of developmental, with at least one-half in the exploratory group (Batdorf, 1978). A recent SREB report states that one of every three students entering college today is not prepared for college work, with the percentage of such students in the South exceeding that of the nation (SREB, 1985). Pantages and Creedon (1978) state that the majority of studies in this area concur that on measures of scholastic aptitude and ability (as measured by SAT and similar tests) there is a significant difference between dropouts and nondropouts. Additional findings reported include: attrition is higher at public than at private colleges; attrition rates were much higher for students with fathers in blue collar occupations; the median income of families of students who drop out was significantly lower than that of persisters; the student who comes from a family background where educational and intellectual achievement is valued is more likely to persist; there is a highly significant relation between attrition and first semester grades; those students most likely to drop out were uncommitted to college and had low aspirations and educational values; having a vocational goal is conducive to persistence; students living off campus are much more likely to drop out than those who live on campus; the amount of time per week spent working is significantly related to attrition, the rate of

attrition increasing as the time working increases. Even such (unlikely) factors as the presence of fraternities and sororities and enrollment in a semester as opposed to a quarter system have been found to have a positive effect upon retention (Pantages and Creedon, 1978).

Regarding attrition of minority students, several sources indicate a consistently wide variation in dropout rates for blacks and whites at all educational levels. Astin reports that whereas 83 percent of whites complete high school, only 72 percent of blacks do so. At the graduate and professional school level, the comparative completion rates reported are eight percent for whites and four percent for blacks (Astin, 1982). Cohen and Brawer report that minority students are more likely to delay entry into college after completing high school, are more likely to attend school part-time, and are more likely to be from low-income families--all of which are factors which have been found to be associated with high rates of attrition (Cohen and Brawer, 1982). Astin (1982) says that commuter institutions clearly do not offer the educational opportunities to minorities that residential universities and colleges offer. He also points out that black students' chances of finishing college are substantially reduced by attending a predominantly white college---particularly colleges of low selectivity (Astin, 1975).

Beal and Noel state that it has long been known that the students most likely to drop out of postsecondary institutions are those who are new to postsecondary education, academically underprivileged, undecided about a college major or career plans, returning adults, economically disadvantaged, or first-generation students (Beal and Noel, 1980). Ramist states that the reasons students give for leaving reflect dissatisfaction with the academic or social life of the institution as it relates to them (Ramist, 1981). Based upon a number of studies, Friedlander concludes that while many students withdraw for reasons over which the college has no control, many others withdraw because they are having difficulties in areas over which the college staff can have a high degree of influence (Friedlander, 1981). Pantages

and Creedon (1978) state: "In terms of sheer numbers, the attrition problem deserves the attention of those interested in and affiliated with institutions of higher education" (p.49). Gainesville Junior College has accepted the challenge, and indeed a challenge it is. In its preliminary report (GJC Retention Study -- Preliminary Report, October 1984), Gainesville Junior College is described as a "non-residential, commuter-based, community college offering a full range of both transfer and career programs" (p.1). It is further described as "essentially open enrollment with the result that a high proportion of its entering students are not prepared for college-level work" (p.2). The report continues: "The area which GJC serves is considerably below average in educational attainment relative to the State of Georgia as a whole. According to the 1970 Census no county in its immediate 10-county service area came up to the statewide level in median grade completed or percentage of high school graduates, and most were far below the average. Hence, a large number of the students at Gainesville Junior College are still first generation high school graduates and obviously are representing their families for the first time in attempting college work" (pp. 2 - 3). The report further indicates that during the period, 1974-75 to 1982-83, the percentage of new students who were classified as developmental studies students ranged from a low of 35.6 percent in 1982-83 to a high of 52.5 percent in 1978-79.

Gainesville Junior College is a two-year, public college whose students' SAT combined verbal and math scores consistently fall well below the national average. Over the years, 70-80 percent of the students have been employed. Recent surveys have revealed that approximately one-half of the current students are employed 40 or more hours per week. A large percentage of students enter Gainesville Junior College without firm long-range educational and career plans. Based upon the President's discussion with new students at the fall 1984 orientation, it was estimated that approximately three-fourths of those students were unsure of their college major. The emerging pattern of student and institutional characteristics, when com-

pared to the findings of numerous studies, points to the conclusion that for Gainesville Junior College to attain a respectable rate of retention will require the concerted efforts of all who share responsibility for the operation of the college.

2. Observations from Institutional Study

Reflecting upon the several sources of data presented in Section II of this study, the following observations relative to attrition at Gainesville Junior College seem to be appropriate.

a. Low educational attainment in the home background of many GJC students seems to encourage the establishment of low levels of expectation and to result in limited home support for college success of many students, thereby leading to increased rates of attrition.

b. Limited academic preparation for college as measured by high school averages, SAT scores, and beginning enrollment status (Developmental Studies or Regular Freshman) are related to patterns of persistence among GJC students with the better prepared students showing higher levels of persistence.

c. Study status--part-time vs. full-time--is related to persistence with full-time students exhibiting higher retention rates.

d. Female students seem to be more persistent with respect to stopout/reentry attendance patterns.

e. The very young students (18 and Less) do not exhibit stopout/reentry persistence tendencies that are present among older students particularly the 19-21 and 31 and Above age groups.

f. Fluctuations in the economy seem to be related to retention rates particularly among part-time students.

g. Availability of course offerings compatible with work schedules and program requirements are related to stopout/reentry patterns particularly of part-time students.

3. Observations Relative to Attrition of Blacks

Additionally, the following observations relative to the attrition of blacks at GJC seem appropriate.

a. Low SAT Verbal scores seem to be highly correlated with dropout potential among black students.

b. Age seems to be related to dropout potential among black students with younger students more likely to persist.

c. Retention of FTF blacks at GJC seems to have improved during the 1983-84 period over the 1982-83 study period while the overall retention of blacks generally remained stable or improved only slightly.

d. Non-traditional, adult blacks are being attracted to GJC in limited numbers with little success evident in retaining the ones who do enroll.

IV. STRATEGIES FOR IMPROVING RETENTION RATE

Gainesville Junior College has throughout its existence been committed to the goal of raising the level of education and awareness in its part of the state. As has been earlier demonstrated, the College's drawing area suffers a marked deficiency in median grade completed and percentage of high school graduates compared to the state as a whole, which in turn ranks low nationally. The leadership of the College realized early that the College not only would receive high-risk applicants due to its open-enrollment structure, but that it should actively recruit and encourage such applicants. The process of raising the educational level in its drawing area had to begin somewhere, and there was ample reason to believe--as history has borne out--that many of the would-be students who seemed high-risk due to low SAT scores had considerably more potential than their scores would imply. In addition, the College realized that a large part of its constituency were working people who could further their education by attending only part-time, primarily at night. Therefore, it committed itself heavily to a night school program and encouraged part-time students, realizing that they tend to be high-risk also as data presented in Section II continue to substantiate.

Beginning in the Fall of 1973, the College established a Division of Special Studies with its own faculty in the areas of English, Mathematics, and Reading. Paraprofessionals were hired to assist in each remedial classroom, and audio-visual aids were developed and purchased for use in a self-paced, developmental studies program. The effects of the College's commitment were clearly evident in its startling success in the Regents' Testing Program in the mid-1970's when, despite the fact that its students scored near the bottom in the University System on the verbal portion of the SAT, the College stood at or near the very top of all the schools in the System in percentage of takers passing the Reading and Essay components of the test.

The college has continued its profound commitment to developmental studies to this date, but, unfortunately, due to the loss of approximately $300,000 per year

in federal funding in the late 1970's, has had to forego the use of paraprofessionals and drop the self-paced method of remediation. The College continues to provide remediation for all students in the areas of English, Reading, and Mathematics who its faculty in the respective areas feel need assistance, and--in addition--the College continues a self-analysis course for all students who are placed for remediation in all three areas. The self-analysis course features career counseling, study skills counseling, and small-group, intensive work in other areas of student concern and need.

During the course of the year, faculty planning time was devoted to careful revision of the self-analysis course. As a part of this process, a decision was made to deliver the course in multiple sections during a common period so as to be able to utilize large group/small group capability and to improve the use of common resource personnel. Aspects of the revised course were used on a limited basis with a small group of students in the spring quarter. Early indications are that adjustments are being appropriately received and accepted by the students. Students who are enrolled in their second, third, or fourth quarter of a Developmental Studies course are offered assistance by the Guidance Center. Additionally, academic advisors and instructors are requested to be sensitive to the special needs of such students as they assist them.

As data presented earlier indicate, a high percentage of new students at the College are classified developmental, and nearly as high a percentage of the graduates are former developmental studies students. The College feels that, within the area of developmental studies, there is little more that it can do for its students with the resources that it has available, and that, even with much greater resources, not too much more could be done.

In academic year 1983-84, a great degree of effort was made to improve the advisement process which resulted in perceptible differences in 1984-85. Placement, transcripting, special studies record-keeping, and advisor assignment and record-

keeping were shifted from decentralized, manual processes to centralized operations on the administrative computer. By the close of the year, a process was in place that allowed the printing, each quarter, of an advising transcript (TRANGUID) containing all placement and advisement information on each current student, and the systematic circulation of this document to the student's academic advisor. During Spring 1984, the advisor had for the first time all the student's placement and course work summarized on one document, available at any time the student came in for advisement. In a continuation of policy established during academic year 1983-84, the student was asked to check with his advisor before any registration or course changes were made.

These procedures have been refined during academic year 1984-85 and have been received with a high degree of positive response by the students and faculty members alike. The availability of the TRANGUID has obviously improved the academic data base upon which counseling and advisement information is shared.

Gainesville Junior College has always been strong in its commitment to counseling. It has a Guidance Center staffed by three professionals, and during academic year 1983-84 the center acquired a computer terminal tying it in with the student records system. The administrative secretary in the center became so adept in using the computer capability that developmental studies records-keeping mentioned above was shifted to the Guidance Center. The center is now able to print an advisement transcript of the type discussed above at any time for its own use in counseling students, and possesses through the computer the means to bring almost any information resource which the College has to bear upon the problem of identifying and counseling high-risk students. Apart from its central participation in the ongoing advisement/retention activities discussed, the center continued to refine its computer operation in 1984-85 and even more fully integrated this resource in its own life and that of the College.

The Financial Aid Office has always been one of the most important retention

tools of the College. The Financial Aid Officer, a counselor by training, is a creative user of the computer. Now beginning the fifth year on a completely computerized financial aid system of his own design, he is more than ever able to let the computer do the records-keeping and analysis for him while he concentrates on his first interest--that of counseling and advising the students who come to him for assistance in financial matters. The College feels that its Financial Aid Officer is one of its greatest assets in the matter of recruitment and retention.

Gainesville Junior College has for several years encouraged new students applying for admission during a coming fall quarter to come in for a day of orientation, advisement, and pre-registration during the summer. The College will once again this summer vigorously encourage new applicants to avail themselves of this opportunity. In addition, the Guidance Center systematically makes appointments with each new student during his/her first quarter of enrollment for counseling in the center.

Preliminary plans were made in the summer of 1984 to develop a persistence quotient using multiple regression capabilities. Due to changes in personnel and equipment outages caused by the upgrading of the institution's computing system, the ability to implement this part of the retention program was thwarted. Reflective consideration has been given to the possibility of instituting that projected activity during the coming year. However, a decision has been reached, in keeping with the extensive information available from other sources about students and their retention potential and with personnel and budget limitations in a small institution like GJC, not to follow through on this possibility. The updated information available on the TRANGUID and a number of other steps which have been described in this report are viewed as further indications that such a procedure would be duplicative.

1. Retention Strategies for "Other Race" Students

Gainesville Junior College is completing its second year of the Minority Advising Program, and the results continue to be encouraging. Evaluation of the first year's activities revealed that the students who chose to participate in the program scored lower on the SAT's than those who chose not to, particularly on the verbal portion of the SAT; yet, a greater percentage of the participants were in good standing spring quarter than were the non-participants. Attrition was approximately the same in the two groups despite the evidence presented earlier in this study that persistence is intimately related to SAT verbal scores. Ninety-seven percent of the participants in the advising program felt that the program made them feel the College really cared about them, and two-thirds felt the program helped them to be successful in their college work.

The evaluation of the 1984-85 program is in process, and complete data from that effort are not available at this time. However, preliminary analyses are revealing similar achievement of program participants which exceed SAT score expectations as well as data that suggest that program participants are showing stronger retention tendencies. These preliminary generalizations are based on the data emerging from the evaluation of the 1984-85 MAP program as reflected in Table IX.

A general feeling has emerged during the course of the year that some black students generally are not responding to the focused attention they are receiving in the Minority Advising Program. While the majority of the black students on campus have participated at times during the year in the program, feedback is frequently received that some do not understand the need for such a program at Gainesville Junior College. Despite these feelings which seem to focus upon particular MAP activities, the overall impact of the program seems more than positive.

During summer 1984, Gainesville Junior College was one of six institutions in the University System participating in the "GEARS" Program aimed at recruiting minority students with special developmental studies needs and providing intensive

TABLE IX

Comparison Of Minority Students Who Participated In The Minority Advising Program With Non-Participating Minority Students 1984-85

	Dimension	MAP Participants	Non-Participants
1.	Minority Students		
	a. Participants/Non-Participants	65.7% (69)	34.3% (36)
2.	Sex		
	a. Female	58.0% (40)	47.0% (17)
	b. Male	42.0% (29)	53.0% (19)
3.	Average SAT Score	582	660
4.	Average GPA (end Winter Quarter)	2.37	2.22
5.	Academic Hours Carried vs. Passed		
	a. Same	53.6%	36.1%
	b. Less than 6 hours difference	13.0%	22.2%
	c. 6-10 hours difference	2.9%	11.1%
	d. 11 or more hrs. difference	7.3%	8.4%
	e. 000[1]	23.2%	22.2%
6.	Academic Standing Mid-Spring Quarter		
	a. Good[2]	76.8% (53)	61.0% (22)
	b. Probation[3]	15.9% (11)	19.5% (7)
	c. Exclusion[4]	7.3% (5)	19.5% (7)
7.	Non-Returns to GJC		
	a. After Fall Quarter	10	14
	b. After Winter Quarter	12	9
	c. Total	31.9% (22)	63.9% (23)
8.	Last Quarter Attended		
	a. Fall	14.5% (10)	38.9% (14)
	b. Winter	17.4% (12)	25.0% (9)
	c. Spring	68.1% (47)	36.1% (13)

[1]Includes new students Spring Quarter and students who have not taken college-credit academic courses.

[2]Includes new Spring Quarter students and all students considered as being in good standing.

[3]Includes Probation I, Probation II, and Readmitted But Progressing students.

[4]Includes students on academic exclusion and final exclusion.

summer enrichment work with the objective of enabling them to enter successfully into the college experience by the following fall quarter. The students who participated in it were closely followed throughout the 1984-85 year. Of the 11 students originally enrolled in the program:

--1 withdrew before the program was concluded;

--1 is attending Lanier Area Technical School;

--4 are attending other institutions--Georgia Institute of Technology (1), Valdosta State College (2), a college in South Carolina (1);

--1 whose status is unknown;

--4 enrolled at Gainesville Junior College.

Of the four students at Gainesville Junior College, two are currently enrolled, one withdrew in the fall quarter, and one withdrew in the winter quarter but plans to reenroll.

Because of the small number of blacks in its service area, the College was not selected to continue in the "GEARS" Program in the summer of 1985.

2. Strategies for Retention of Students

A number of specific additional initiatives were taken during the year to focus increased attention at Gainesville Junior College upon student retention. They are listed below to illustrate the continuing importance placed upon this concern by this institution.

a. The fall quarter Work Conference focused upon Retention with Fran Rauschenberg of the University of Georgia providing primary leadership with follow-up support from the Dean of the College, the Director of Guidance Services, and the Director of Institutional Research.

b. Based upon positive response to telephone contacts with students who withdrew from the College during the fall quarter, which was initiated on an experimental basis, this follow-up process was repeated in the winter quarter and has been implemented on a regular basis each quarter. Systematic record-

keeping has emerged around this process, and this duty has been assigned as a regular responsibility to the Director of Student Activities each quarter.

c. The Dean of the College, new in his position this year, initiated a "Dean's Other List" procedure. Faculty members were encouraged and urged to identify students who were having academic difficulty and submit their names to him before mid-quarter. Individual letters from the Dean were written to the students as the mid-quarter drop date approached. The letters of encouragement gave students an opportunity to draw upon the larger resources of the College, but also to visit with the Dean if they felt a visit might be beneficial. The response of students to this procedure has been most encouraging. Plans are to continue this process in the quarters ahead.

d. Another initiative taken by the Dean of the College resulted in a revision of the academic progress/standing procedures. These adjustments should improve first-quarter retention results.

e. During the Spring of 1985, the Dean of the College also instituted a series of workshops designed to address three critical areas related to student retention: (1) Advisement, (2) Orientation and Registration, and (3) Student Performance and Progress. These workshops were scheduled in such a way as to provide 10 different opportunities for faculty and staff to participate in a one-hour session. The workshops were conducted by the Dean and basically involved a discussion of those "problem areas" or "problem perceptions" related to the above items.

f. Three changes in the withdrawal process have been effected: (1) A greater effort has been made to assure that all students have an exit interview with one of the counselors. (2) Students have been encouraged to have individual conferences with the President and/or Dean as part of the withdrawal process. A limited number of students have availed themselves of this opportunity. (3) A special questionnaire was developed, which is to be completed in conjunction

with the exit interview (See Attachment I). Counselors are using the information obtained from the questionnaire and the exit interview as the basis for appropriate follow-up contacts with the students.

g. Each academic division has conducted a thorough review of course prerequisite requirements. Student schedules are monitored immediately following registration to assure that they have the preparation which is deemed necessary for success in their courses.

h. A Fall-to-Winter Attrition Study was initiated during the year of students who were enrolled in the fall, not enrolled in the winter, and subsequently reenrolled in the spring. Analysis of results of that study were presented in tabular form in earlier sections of this report. The data-gathering strategy is to be continued on an annual basis with an ability to look at progress over time on the question of students' dropping in and dropping out at Gainesville Junior College.

i. The Guidance Center has extended its services to be more accessible to evening students and those students enrolled at Gwinnett Area Technical School.

j. The College has increased from three to four quarters the maximum number of quarters allowed students to complete a Developmental Studies area (English, Mathematics, Reading).

k. A review is currently in process of the Developmental Studies curricular and course content.

3. A Look Ahead

Gainesville Junior College has made a significant effort in the past two years to address the problems of the retention question as noted in last year's Retention Study and in this report. These efforts are compatible with the overall commitments made by GJC historically to its students. Basically, the feelings remain positive about the results being received from these efforts. The overwhelming emphasis

in the intervention strategies has been upon improved delivery of educational and support services as called for by Ramist (1981) with hoped for improvements in retention as a byproduct and not the original goal.

Currently, plans are to maintain generally the several strategies which have been described, fine-tune them in the coming year, and give them a chance to work over a period of time. No major new initiatives are planned at this time. Focus will be upon using more effectively the emerging data base which is being produced by the systematic attention being given to the progress or lack of progress of students at GJC.

Data which indicate that First-Time Freshman black students may need more attention have resulted in some planned changes in the MAP program in the coming year. Consideration is being given to narrowing the focus of that program to native American blacks only with particular emphasis given to FTF and some limited involvement of sophomore blacks as they might provide a resource to those students and to the MAP program generally. During the past two years the College has tried to work with all blacks, including international blacks, in a focused way. The feedback that some of the MAP programs are not necessary which seems to be coming from sophomore and international students, coupled with the obvious need to focus on FTF, provides the basis for the proposed changes in the MAP program.

Additional attention will also be given to older black students. Data indicated that retention success with that small group is very limited.

ATTACHMENT I

GAINESVILLE JUNIOR COLLEGE
STUDENT REQUEST TO BE WITHDRAWN

To request withdrawal from GJC, please complete all items on this form and give it to the counselor who assists with your withdrawal.

Name _____ SS# ____/___/____
Last First Middle/Maiden

Mailing Address _____ Home Phone _____

_____ Work Phone _____

For which quarter are you requesting withdrawal? _____
Quarter Year

Have you attended ANY classes? Yes____ No ____
Are you receiving financial aid administered by the College? Yes____ No ____

Please check ANY/ALL of the factors listed below which influenced your decision to withdraw from GJC:

___a. Financial Reasons
___b. Received Job Offer
___c. Change in work hours
___d. Moved from the area
___e. No Transportation
___f. Personal Health Reasons
___g. Personal/Family Problems
___h. Course(s) Cancelled
___i. Course(s) too difficult
___j. Not enough time for study
___k. Don't like course(s)
___l. Don't need course(s)
___m. Career plans changed
___n. Other. Please explain:
_____
_____

NOW please CIRCLE the ONE factor above which MOST influenced your decision to withdraw.

Do you plan to return to GJC in the future?
___a. Yes....I plan to return _____ Quarter, 19____
___b. No
___c. Not sure

What are your plans for the immediate future?
___a. Full-time employment
___b. Enroll in another school...Where? _____
___c. Other. Please specify _____
_____

If uncertain about your future plans, would you like to discuss them with a counselor at a later date?
___Yes...Please call me after _____ (date)
___Yes...I'll let you know when I'm ready
___No....but I'll let you know if I change my mind

Dean Gurr and/or President Watkins would like to talk with you about your experience at GJC and get your ideas about how the College can better serve our students. Are you willing to talk with them?
___Yes...Dean Gurr ___ President Watkins___
___Prefer NOT to at this time, but will consider it later

_____ _____
Today's Date Signature

On the back of this sheet please add any comments or suggestions you would like to make.

Counselor _____

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Astin, Alexander W. Preventing Students from Dropping Out. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Astin, Alexander W. Minorities in American Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.

Batdorf, Richard L. "Recruiting Students to Stay." Address Presented at the Pacific Northwest Regional Conference of the National Council on Community Relations. Portland, Oregon. August 30 and 31, 1978.

Beal, P.E. and Noel, L. What Works in Student Retention. Iowa City, Iowa: ACT and NCHEMS, 1980.

Cohen, Arthur M. and Brawer, Florence B. The American Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.

Friedlander, Jack. "Why Students Drop Courses." ERIC Clearinghouse For Junior Colleges, Los Angeles, January, 1981.

Fuller, Donald. Gainesville Junior College Retention Study -- Preliminary Report. October, 1984.

Noel, Lee. "College Student Retention - A Campus-Wide Responsibility." The National ACAC Journal, Vol. 21, No. 1, July, 1976.

Pantages, Timothy J. and Creedon, Carol F. "Studies of College Attrition: 1950-1975." Review of Educational Research. Vol. 48, No. 1, Winter, 1978.

Ramist, Leonard. "College Student Attrition and Retention." ETS Findings, Vol. VI, No. 2, 1981.

"Unprepared College Students: High Schools and Colleges Respond:." SREB Report, Atlanta, Georgia, April 1985.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges

JUL 12 1985